



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/909,667	07/20/2001	Stephen D. Kuslich	S85.2-9892	1524
490	7590	12/24/2003	EXAMINER	
VIDAS, ARRETT & STEINKRAUS, P.A. 6109 BLUE CIRCLE DRIVE SUITE 2000 MINNETONKA, MN 55343-9185			PHILOGENE, PEDRO	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3732		

DATE MAILED: 12/24/2003

16

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/909,667	KUSLICH ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Pedro Philogene	3732

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 October 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,3-13,15-20 and 25 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,3-13,15-20 and 25 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/24/03 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 3, 4, 5, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because they are drawn to non-statutory subject matter. In claims 3-5, applicant positively recites part of a human, i.e., "the vertebra, femoral head and tibia plateau. Thus, claims 3-5 include a human within their scope and are non-statutory. A claim directed to or including in its scope a human is not considered to be patentable subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-13, 15-20, 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cragg (6,558,390) in view of Kuslich (5,549,679).

With respect to claim 1, 15, 17, 19, Cragg discloses a method of treating a bone abnormality in a body comprising the following steps; exposing an area of bone having an abnormality; as best seen in FIGS. 27-31, the abnormality is selected from at least one member of the group consisting of: compression fracture of the spine and any combination thereof, forming at least one cavity in the bone, wherein a portion of the at least one cavity defines an opening, inserting an expandable empty fabric bag into the at least one cavity through the opening, the bag being formed of a fabric wall, the bag defining an interior and having an exterior; packing the bag through a fill opening with material that will support or promote bone growth through the fabric wall, the packing causing the bag to expand until the bag and material combination form a self-retaining rigid shape, wherein the exterior of the bag is substantially in contact with the bone of the cavity, the plurality of bag openings constructed and arranged to substantially prevent the material from passing from the interior of the bag to the exterior of the bag; as set forth in columns 32-33, lines 25-67 and lines 1-19 respectively.

Although Cragg teaches of bag openings, it is noted that Cragg did not teach of bag openings between about 0.25 to 0.5 mm in diameter, as claimed by applicant. However, in similar art, Kuslich evidences the use of a bag having openings between about 0.25 to 0.5 mm in diameter to promote bone growth through the fabric wall.

Therefore, given the teaching of Kuslich, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to incorporate openings

between about 0.25 mm to about 0.5 mm in diameter in the bag of Cragg to promote bone growth through the fabric wall.

With respect to claims 3-13,16,18,20, the above combinations of references disclose all the method steps, as set forth.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1,2-13,15-20,25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

4,755,184 07-1988 Silverberg

6,235,043 05-2001 Reiley et al.

Reiley et al teach of treating a femoral head and a tibia plateau with a balloon.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pedro Philogene whose telephone number is (703) 308-2252. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 6:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin P Shaver can be reached on (703) 308-2582. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9302.

Art Unit: 3732

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0858.


PEDRO PHILOGENE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Pedro Philogene
December 18, 2003